A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—" As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that " Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—" As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that " Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus: — "As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus: — "As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—" As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that " Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—" As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that " Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

The reviewer then goes on with his sophistry, to endeavour to set aside this rule, thus:—"As it must be an object, in all astronomical tables, to represent the state of the heavens tolerably near the truth at the time when they are composed, it must be allowed that this rule is not destitute of plausibility. On examination, however, it will be found very fallacious, and such as might lead into great mistakes." The reviewer then proceeds to show his extraordinary skill and sagacity, by saying, that "Astronomical tables are liable to errors of two different kinds, that may sometimes be in the same, sometimes in opposite directions. One of them concerns the radical places at the epoch from which the motions are counted, the other concerns the mean motions themselves, that is to say, the mean rate, or angular velocity of the planet. Of these the first remains fixed, and its effect at all times is the same: the second again is variable, and its effect increases proportionally to the time. If, therefore, they are opposite, the one in excess and the other in defect, they must partly destroy one another; and the one, increasing continually, will at length become equal to the other, when there will of consequence be no error at all; after which the error will fall on the opposite side, and will increase continually. Here the moment of no error, or that when the tables are perfectly correct, is evidently distant from the time

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy

A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy